



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,361	12/14/2001	Francis M. Wilkinson	P6468	2820
25235	7590	02/23/2005	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500 1200 SEVENTEENTH ST DENVER, CO 80202				PARDO, THUY N
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2165		

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/023,361	WILKINSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Thuy Pardo	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed on October 29, 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on October 29, 2004 in response to Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed. Claims 1, 9, and 18 have been amended.
2. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. (Hereinafter "Carter") US Patent No. 6,026,474, in view of Nye US Patent No. 2002/0156917.

As to claim 1, Carter teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:
a client device [400, 420 of fig. 12] linked to the communications network including a running application [web pages 402 of fig. 12], an administrative interface in communication with the application and the communications network [32a of fig. 1; col. 4, lines 40-52], and a

local memory [local cache system, fig. 7] for storing localized application values used by the application [web cache, col. 2, lines 38-55; ab; fig. 7]; and

an application value repository linked to the communications network for storing localized application values used by the computing devices [fig. 9];
wherein the administrative interface is operable to receive a request from the application for application values and to respond by selectively retrieving the localized application values corresponding to the request from the local memory [col. 20, lines 52-59] and the application value repository [ab; col. 5, lines 48 to col. 6, lines 10; col. 14, lines 21-51].

However, Carter does not explicitly teach that the localized application values are selected based upon a geographical area and a language selection included in the request. Nye teaches that the localized application values are selected based upon a geographical area and a language selection included in the request [methods to restrict searches on language and geographic regions, 0029; 0227; 0251].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Nye to the system of Carter as an essential means to speed up the search process in the computer network and provide the most relevant search results to the searchers.

As to claim 2, Carter and Nye teach the invention substantially as claimed. Carter further teaches an update mechanism operable to monitor the localized application values at the application value repository and to update the localized application values in the local memory [col. 9, lines 15-28].

As to claim 3, Carter and Nye teach the invention substantially as claimed. Carter further teaches that the localized application values stored in the local memory are selected based on prior requests from the application and are removed from the local memory when a last accessed time parameter indicates a period of inactivity has been exceeded [col. 8, lines 4-11; col. 10, lines 5-18].

As to claim 4, Carter and Nye teach the invention substantially as claimed. Carter further teaches that the client device further includes a mechanism operable to generate a localized extensible Markup Language (XML)file comprising at least a portion of the localized application values [inherent in the system, col. 26, lines 60-67].

As to claim 5, Carter and Nye teach the invention substantially as claimed. Carter further teaches that the application value repository further stores a stylesheet that is adapted for combining with the XML file to produce a localized stylesheet [col. 26, lines 60 to col. 27, lines 13].

As to claim 6, Carter and Nye teach the invention substantially as claimed. Carter further teaches that the localized application values stored in the application value repository include property values [col. 22, lines 10-19; col. 23, lines 52-57].

As to claims 9, 11, 14-18, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As to claim 7, Carter and Nye teach the invention substantially as claimed. However neither Carter nor Nye teach that the feature that the localized application values include user roles indicating data access levels for users of the application, the user roles being localized to allow variation based on geographical locations selected by the users of the application and being used by the administrative interface in the selective retrieving of the localized application values. Beurket teaches the feature that the localized application values include user roles indicating data access levels for users of the application, the user roles being localized to allow variation based on geographical locations selected by the users of the application and being used by the administrative interface in the selective retrieving of the localized application values [col. 2, lines 56-67; col. 4, lines 50 to col. 5, lines 15]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Beurket to Carter-Nye's system as an essential means to provide persistent storage of data, and each instance of the control program employs the data store as a memory device for storing and retrieving cached data.

As to claims 8, 10, 12, 13, and 19-21, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on October 29, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Carter does not teach localized application values stored at a client device and an administration interface provided on the client device that responds to a request for application data by selectively retrieving localized application values either from the local memory or from an application value repository.

As to point this, Examiner respectfully disagrees. It should be noted that Carter has taught these features. Carter teaches shared client-side web caching where browser applications have been stored [see ab; fig. 2, 7 and 8]. Furthermore, Examiner cannot find any feature in claims or in Specification of applicant's application suggested that localized application values must be stored at the client device. Examiner believes that the user computer systems 14 and 60 communicate with the central application value repository 50 through the communication links 42, 56, and 58 [see fig. 1 of the application] as same as Carter's teachings [see ab; fig. 2, 7-8, and the details of the Office action]. Examiner also believes that since Carter teaches the feature of retrieving localized application values either from the local memory or from an application value repository, the administration interface is inherent in the system in order to communicate between the client device and the local memory.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to newly added limitations in claims 1, 9, and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at 571-272-4083.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned as follows:

(703) 872-9306 (Official Communication)

and/or:

571-273-4082 (Use this Fax#, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "Draft" communication. Examiner may request that a formal/amendment be faxed directly to then on occasions).

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121
Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

February 17, 2004



**THUY N. PARDO
PRIMARY EXAMINER**